

Remarks***Status of the Claims***

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-11, 13-18 and 23-28 remain pending in the application. Of these, claims 1 and 11 are independent. Claims 12, 19-22, 29 and 30 remain canceled. Claims 1-3, 9, 11, and 26-28 are sought to be amended. Applicants believe that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. US 2001/0042223 A1 (hereinafter referred to as “Hoskins”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,731 (hereinafter referred to as “Crouch”). Claims 11 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoskins and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,021 (hereinafter referred to as “Sugibayashi”) and Crouch. Claims 2 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoskins in view of Crouch and further in view of Sugibayashi. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoskins in view of Crouch and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,768 (hereinafter referred to as “Lin”). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoskins in view of Crouch and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,922,451 (hereinafter referred to as “Lo”) and U.S. Patent No. 3,735,368 (hereinafter referred to as “Beausoliel”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-11, 13-18 and 23-28 since Crouch, Hoskins,

Sugibayashi, Lin, Lo and Beausoliel, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1 and 11 (and their dependent claims 2-10, 13-18 and 23-28) for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include a similar feature of binning out the total memory capacity of the integrated circuit. Crouch, Hoskins, Sugibayashi, Lin, Lo and Beausoliel, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest binning out the total memory capacity of the integrated circuit. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1 and 11 (and their dependent claims 2-10, 13-18 and 23-28) are patentable over Crouch, Hoskins, Sugibayashi, Lin, Lo and Beausoliel, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: 5-2-05

/Molly A. McCall/
Molly A. McCall
Patent Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
Registration No. 46,126
(703) 633-3311

P14044 reply to final office action

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1400, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

5-2-05
Date of Deposit
Katherine Jennings
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence
Katherine Jennings 5-2-05
Signature Date